

EVALUATION OF MASTER TRAINERS' TRAINING COURSE

S. K. Maharana¹, N. R. Patel² and S. R. Patel³

ABSTRACT

A series of specialized courses on advance training methods for the scientists/ teachers of SAUs who act as master trainers in technology transfer programmes was conducted by EEI, Anand. An effort has been made to evaluate the trainings. The results of the study depict that majority of the master trainers possessed medium level of knowledge and also using training methodology to a medium extent. These were found to be influenced by their job involvement, extension role perception and attitude towards bi-monthly workshop. Concurrently, the extent of use of information sources and job satisfaction were also found to influence their extent of use of training methodology.

INTRODUCTION

Training is a powerful means to catalyses human resource development. Significance of training has been well established in the field of agriculture. For training to be productive, training programmes should be well planned, well managed and appropriate training methodology be used which in turn require competent trainers. In training and visit system, scientists of the state agricultural universities (SAUs) impart training to the subject matter specialists who in turn train AEOs and VEWs. These scientists cum master trainers are engaged in research or teaching work. As a master trainer one must have sufficient knowledge and skill in training methodology without which the training effort will be a failure. In this context, Gupta and Patel (1991-92) rightly observed that master trainers of Gujarat Agricultural University (GAU) should be trained in proper use of audio visual aids in order to communicate message effectively to SMSs. Moreover the agenda notes of National Seminar on

Agriculture Extension (1992) indicated that monthly workshop had become routine work with little flow of location specific technology (Anonymous, 1992).

After 1992, looking to the needs of GAU, the Extension Education Institute, Anand conducted specialized courses on advance training methods for the scientists/ teachers of SAUs who act as master trainers in technology transfer programmes. To determine how far such training has helped master trainers in their training endeavor, the present investigation was aimed with the following specific objectives:

1. To know the level of knowledge of the master trainers regarding training methodology.
2. To study the extent of use of training methodology by the master trainers while giving training.
3. To find out the relationship between independent variables and the level of knowledge of master trainers regarding training methodology.

1 Ex. P. G. Student, B. A. College of Agriculture, G.A.U., Anand

2 Associate Extension Educationist, EEI, G.A.U., Anand

3 Agriculture Officer, EEI, G.A.U., Anand

Table 1: Distribution of the master trainers according to their level of knowledge regarding training methodology N=120

Category	Score range	No	Per cent
Low	Below 68-10	17	14.17
Medium	68.10- 94.38	91	75.83
High	Above 94-38	12	10.00
Total		120	100.00

Mean = 81.24 S.D. = 13.14

4. To find out the relationship between independent variables and use of training methodology by the master trainers.

METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted in the GAU. The participants of the said training programme were from various colleges/projects/ schemes of GAU, scattered all around the state. In total 200 master trainers had participated in the training programme conducted during year 1995-96 and 1996-97. All of them were asked for responses. Out of them, complete response in all respect was received from 120 master trainers which were used for analysis.

The study was based on ex-post facto research design. A teacher made test was developed to measure the extent of knowledge of master trainers regarding training methodology. Extent of use of training methodology was measured by a

structured questionnaire which contained fifteen key strategies of various principles/functions and aspects of training required for effective training management. The data were collected with the help of a well structured and pre-tested questionnaire through personal contact as well as mail. The data collected were tabulated, analyzed and interpreted in the light of objectives.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE

The data in Table 1 reveals that more than three fourth (75.83 per cent) of the master trainers had medium level of knowledge, while 10.00 per cent respondents had high level of knowledge. The above finding points out that most of the master trainers (85.83 per cent) were better equipped with the knowledge of training methodology and it is expected that they conduct training programme in a better way.

Table 2: Distribution of the master trainers according to their extent Use of training methodology N=120

Category	Score Range	No	Per cent
Low	Below 32.13	18	15.00
Medium	31.13 - 42.37	86	71.67
High	Above 42.37	16	13.33
Total		120	100.00

Mean = 32.25

S.D. = 5.12

Table 3: Relationship of independent variables of master trainers with their knowledge level and extent of use of training methodology

Sr. NO	Characteristics	Extent of knowledge ("r" value)	Use of methodology ("r" value)
1	Age	-0.00650	0.08871
2	Education	-0.00839	-0.05988
3	Cadre	-0.07233	-0.02870
4	Family background	0.00538	0.04437
5	Length of service	-0.03713	0.08198
6	Training received	-0.09721	0.03140
7	Membership in professional organization	0.06304	-0.05451
8	Scientific productivity	-0.14941	-0.26567 *
9	Extent of use of information source	0.10314	0.29918 *
10	Communication load	-0.02498	-0.01429
11	Job satisfaction	0.14158	0.25054 *
12	Job involvement	0.29599 *	0.44999 *
13	Present aspiration	0.09140	-0.03548
14	Future aspiration	0.22955 *	-0.00458
15	Extension role perception	0.23077 *	0.38649 *
16	Attitude towards bi-monthly workshop	0.20988 *	0.40964 *
17	Extent of knowledge	-	0.42060 *
18	Extent use of training methodology	0.42060 *	-

* Significant at 0.01 level of probability

Extent of use of training methodology

It is observed from Table 2 that majority (71.67 per cent) of the master trainers were moderate users of training methodology, whereas 17.00 per cent used it to a low extent and 13.33 per cent used it to a high extent.

Relationship of independent variables with knowledge level and extent use of training methodology

The 'r' value presented in Table 3 indicates that the independent variables viz. job involvement, future aspiration, extension role perception and attitude towards bi-monthly workshop had positive and significant relationship with the knowledge level of the master trainers.

In case of extent of use of training methodology, the independent variables

such as extent of use of information sources, job satisfaction, job involvement, extension role perception and attitude towards bi-monthly workshop showed positive and significant relationship. Surprisingly, the scientific productivity showed negative and significant relationship with the extent of use of training methodology.

Further, knowledge level of master trainers and their extent use of training methodology were positively and significantly related with each other.

CONCLUSION

The findings led to conclude that majority of the master trainers possessed medium level of knowledge and also using training methodology to a medium extent. These were found to be influenced by their job involvement, extension role perception and

attitude towards bi-monthly workshop. In addition to this, future aspiration was found to influence the knowledge level. At the same time, the extent of use of information sources and job satisfaction were also found to influence their extent of use of training methodology. It indicates that these variables should be taken into consideration while organizing training programme for master trainers.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous, 1992. Agenda Notes. National Seminar on Agricultural Extension, Directorate of Extension, Ministry of Agriculture, Govt. of India, New Delhi: 39-42.
- Gupta, Ashok K. and Patel, B. T. 1991. An analysis of Monthly Workshop conducted by Gujarat Agricultural University. Gujarat Journal of Extension Education, 2 & 3 : 152-153.
-